

KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
United States Attorney

EUMI L. CHOI (WVBN 0722)  
Chief, Criminal Division

CHRISTINA HUA (CSBN 185358)  
Assistant United States Attorney  
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
San Francisco, California 94102-3495  
Telephone: (415) 436-7534  
FAX: (415) 436-7234  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
VALERIANA AU, )  
a/k/a Valerie Mok, )  
 )  
Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

No. CR 06-0615-JSW

**STIPULATION AND  
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER REGARDING  
EXCLUSION OF TIME**

The defendants came before Magistrate Judge James Larson for Identification of Counsel on September 28, 2006. The matter was set over to October 26, 2006 before the Honorable Jeffrey S. White for the initial status hearing. The parties agreed, and the Court found, that the time between September 28, 2006 and October 26, 2006 is properly excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code, Sections 3161(h)(8)(A) and (h)(B)(iv). Defense attorney Nina Wilder requires time to request and review the discovery, and the parties agree that the continuance from September 28, 2006 to October 26, 2006 is reasonable time necessary for purposes of adequate preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. The parties agree that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested

//

//

1 continuance outweigh the best interest of of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial.

2  
3  
4 DATED: 9/29/06

/S/ Christina Hua  
CHRISTINA HUA  
Assistant United States Attorney

5  
6  
7 DATED: 9/29/06

/S/ Nina Wilder  
NINA WILDER  
Counsel for Valeriana Au

8  
9  
10 ORDER

11 For the foregoing reasons, and as stated on the record at the September 28, 2006 hearing in  
12 this matter, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the period between September 28, 2006 and October  
13 26, 2006 excluded from the speedy trial calculation under Title 18, United States Code, Sections  
14 3161(h)(8)(A) and (h)(B)(iv). The Court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance  
15 would unreasonably deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective  
16 preparation, taking into account due diligence by defense counsel. The Court finds that the ends  
17 of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public  
18 and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases.  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20  
21 DATED: October 4, 2006

